

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
FOR
THE TOWN OF MCCLEARY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

DATE ISSUED:
JANUARY 10, 1979

The preparation of this report was financially aided through a grant from the Washington State Department of Ecology with funds obtained from the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, and appropriated for Section 308 of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972.

1. DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT FOR THE TOWN OF MCCLEARY COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.

2. INTRODUCTION

a) The proposed action is the adoption of a comprehensive plan by the Town Council of the Town of McCleary. Pursuant to SEPA guidelines, this environmental analysis will consider not only the action of adoption but also the subsequent actions of implementing the plan in so far as such implementation can be foreseen and can be related to the initial action of adoption. The detailed provisions of the proposal are contained in the publication The Town of McCleary Comprehensive Plan: Part Two The Comprehensive Plan, as revised to the latest date. This plan relies on a publication entitled the Town of McCleary Comprehensive Plan: Part One Inventory and Analysis, (September, 1978) and this statement for its analytical base.

The plan covers the incorporated area of McCleary and the immediate vicinity as described in the plan.

b) The lead agency is the Town and the Superintendent of Public Works is the responsible official.

c) The Statement has been prepared by the staff of the Grays Harbor Regional Planning Commission.

d) While the proposal itself consists of only the action of the Town Council in the adoption of the plan, it is envisioned that this statement may be applicable to all further implementing steps and procedures of the Town. Since it is hoped that the plan will also be considered by the County and the Regional Planning Commissions, this statement may be applicable to those deliberations, and any resulting implementing measures.

e)f) All information regarding this statement can be obtained from the offices of the authors, the Grays Harbor Regional Planning Commission office, 207½ E. Market, Aberdeen, WA. Copies of the EIS may be obtained for the cost of \$2.50.

This EIS is issued on January 10, 1979.

HT 393
W2
M35
1979

All comments regarding the EIS shall be submitted to the Town by February 14, 1979.

3. TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction	1
Table of Contents	2
Distribution List	2
Summary of the Environmental Impact Statement	2
Description of the proposal	4
Existing Environmental Conditions	6
Impact of the Proposal on the Environment	10
Physical Environment	10
Human Environment	14
Relationship Between Short-Term Uses and Long-Term Losses	16
Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitments of Resources	17
Adverse Environmental Impacts Which May be Mitigated	18
Alternatives to the Proposal	18
Unavoidable Adverse Impacts	22

4. DISTRIBUTION LIST

- A. Grays Harbor County
- B. Grays Harbor Regional Planning Commission
- C. Department of Ecology
- D. Grays Harbor Public Utility District #1
- E. McCleary School District
- F. Department of Commerce and Economic Development
- G. Department of Fisheries
- H. Department of Natural Resources
- I. Office of Community Development
- J. Department of Transportation
- K. Washington Public Power Supply System

5. SUMMARY OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

This EIS considers the action of adopting and implementing a proposed compre-

hensive plan by the Town of McCleary and the coordinated actions of the county related to that action. In order to conduct this analysis, the plan in all detail is assumed to be implemented and the conditions that would then be created are compared to existing conditions to identify the impacts that would result.

This statement notes that the proposed plan is a range of policies which seek to balance competing environmental, social, and economic needs in the community in the face of a rapidly rising growth pressure, pressure which could significantly change the character of the Town. This balancing, thus, creates environmental costs to satisfy economic and social needs, while attempting to keep those costs at minimum. Basically, these impacts may be related to the following features of the plan.

- A. The plan permits moderate growth primarily in the incorporated limits. Such growth would result in increased traffic, noise, glare, consumption, and waste over existing conditions. Expected increases, however, should not be to levels inconsistent with the area's small-town character.
- B. The plan commits particular areas to particular uses, thereby foreclosing the employment of these areas for other uses. By providing the space for these uses, however, the plan is expected to divert development from other areas and preserve present natural resources and small-town character, thereby, reserving them for the future.
- C. By permitting development, residential and industrial construction may be anticipated.

Such impacts are less significant or pose less severity in their consequences than the potential impacts of the other identified alternatives of action. Alternatives considered include 1) no action, 2) directing growth to incorporated boundaries (a major portion of the plan); 3) directing growth to temporary housing areas (also part of the plan), 4) directing growth to concentrated service areas; and 5) dispersing growth in a broad, even pattern around the Town.

The statement notes that the mitigation of specific impacts arising from anticipated construction cannot be mitigated completely at this planning stage, and the statement recognizes that such mitigating measures can be better evaluated under the terms of SEPA at the time of implementation.

6. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSAL

- A. Name and Sponsor of Proposal: Town of McCleary: The Town of McCleary Comprehensive Plan.
- B. Location of Project: The incorporated limits and immediate area of the Town of McCleary.
- C. Related File Numbers: Unknown
- D. Phasing of Construction: The proposed plan will be gradually implemented as development proceeds under the policy framework of the plan. Each construction project will be subject to the requirements of SEPA to the extent that aspects of such projects are not included under this statement
- E. Major Features of the Proposal: The proposal includes the following major features:
 - 1. Policies encouraging economic growth to a level which will not exceed the capacity of planned water and sewer facilities.
 - 2. An increased rate as a bedroom Town serving workers in Olympia or the Harbor Area (Aberdeen, Hoquiam).
 - 3. Policies encouraging growth, first, within Town boundaries, and, second, upon lands around the Town when areas in Town cannot effectively accommodate additional growth or when such growth is considered without negative impact upon the Town's development and facility services.
 - 4. Allowing provision of temporary housing areas designed to house nuclear power plant construction workers provided a) such areas have adequate

means of waste disposal and b) a means of renovation of the area is assured once it has served its purpose.

5. Policies preventing major development on steep slopes.
6. Policies directing development upon soils with strongest capacities to support building foundations and to handle septic fields where sewer do not exist.
7. Policies encouraging continued commercial growth near the Town's center and discouraging it along the Town's outer arterials.
8. Policies encouraging commercial activities which are land extensive or serve travelers' needs to establish in the areas along Simpson Street west of 10th Street.
9. Policies cautiously encouraging industrial development within the municipal boundaries in areas adequately served by water, sewer, and transportation facilities--each project subject to SEPA requirements.
10. Policies preserving low-density residential character, uniform throughout the Town at 9 units per acre or 10 units per block as determined by Town Council.
11. Policies allowing multi-family structures provided: a) they occur near the Town's center and b) their existence does not exceed the desired low-density character of the Town.
12. Policies directing residential development to primarily the incorporated areas.
13. Developing housing for elderly residents so they can remain Town residents.
14. Encouraging building renovation where needed.

15. Policies insuring provision of public services and facilities to Town residents prior to areawide residents.

16. Policies encouraging provision of as much as 44% more housing units by 1990.

F. Related to other Plans: This proposal seeks to establish a comprehensive plan for the Town and its environs. The plan represents a refinement of regional and county plans and conforms in intent to the policies of those plans. The urban development objectives of the plan tend to promote regional policies intended to conserve natural resources, while meeting regional housing, commercial and employment needs.

7. EXISTING ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS

The existing environmental conditions in the planning area are described in numerous existing works, the most significant of which are the Part I document of the plan itself, the Washington Nuclear Power Plants 3 and 5 Environmental Impact Statement (WNP 3/5 EIS), Grays Harbor Erosion Control Plan, the Grays Harbor Water Quality Plan, and other works on file with the Regional Planning Commission at 207½ E. Market, Aberdeen. Specifically, the elements of the environment are found in the references identified below, if not summarized here.

A. Elements of the Physical Environment

1. Earth:

- a) Geology: Discussed on pages 3 through 5, Part I of the Plan Document.
- b) Soils: Pages 6 through 14 of Part I
- c) Unique Physical Features: none
- d) Erosion: Discussed in detail in the Grays Harbor Erosion Control Plan
- e) Accretion: none

2. Air:

- a) Air Quality: Quality very good with no major point source of pollution. Air quality is discussed in detail in the WNP 3/5 EIS.

- b) Odor: No major unpleasant odors in McCleary.
- c) Climate: Page 1 of Part I of the Comprehensive Plan and the WNP 3/5 EIS.

3. Water:

- a) Surface Water Movement: Pages 14 and 15, Part I of the Comprehensive Plan.
- b) Runoff/Absorption: Discussed in some detail in McCleary Comprehensive Sewer Study, Volume 1, page IV-18.
- c) Flooding: Heavy rains and water runoff during winter months along with Chehalis River flooding, has created flooding problems in McCleary along Wildcat Creek. The Town has received monies to construct flood prevention structures and is in the process of doing so.
- d) Surface Water: Pages 14 and 15, Part I of Comprehensive Plan.
- e) Surface Water Quality: See the Grays Harbor Water Quality Management Plan on file with the Grays Harbor Regional Planning Commission at 207½ E. Market, Aberdeen.
- f), g), and h), Groundwater: Page 5, Part I of Comprehensive Plan.
- i) Public Water Supply: Pages 66, 68, and 69, Part I, Comprehensive Plan.

4. Flora: The area presently, as in past periods, is covered with dense forest of varying species of trees, particularly conifers. Douglas Fir, Western Hemlock, Western Red Cedar, and Sitka Spruce are all common. Farmland vegetation is less prevalent in the McCleary area than in other areas near Chehalis River. Open lands around the Town are few and interspersed along roads.

Detailed inventories of the vegetation of the Chehalis Valley may be found in the environmental reports prepared for the nuclear power plants of Satsop.

5. Fauna: Pages 14 through 17 of the Comprehensive Plan briefly provide inventory of the area's fauna. A more detailed inventory can be found in the WNP 3/5 environmental impact statements.
6. Noise: Noise from industry is concentrated around the door factory and the one shakemill in the northern part of Town. This noise is not considered significant. Vehicular sounds along Simpson and Summit Roads constitute major noise intrusion.
7. Light and Glare: While Simpson Lumber operates strong night lights along Simpson Avenue, levels of light and glare have been noted as insignificant.
8. Existing Land Use: Page 19 through 31 of Part I, The Comprehensive Plan.
9. Use of Natural Resources: The uses of natural resources in the planning area consists primarily of:
 - a) Use of space for development (commercial, residential, and industrial).
 - b) Harvest of forest products.
 - c) Limited agricultural use.
 - d) Treated sewage discharge into Wildcat Creek.All uses except (a) are renewable.
10. Risk of Explosion or Hazardous Emission: None that are known.

B. Elements of the Human Environment

1. Population. Discussed in Part I, pages 32 through 53 and pages 94 through 107 (for projections) of the Comprehensive Plan.
2. Housing: See Part I, Chapter IV of the Comprehensive Plan.
3. Transportation/Circulation: Pages 70 through 72 of Part I.

4. Public Services: All are discussed within Part I of the Comprehensive Plan on:
 - a) Fire - pages 76 through 79
 - b) Police - page 78
 - c) Schools - pages 72 through 76
 - d) Parks - pages 80 and 81
 - e) Maintenance - Sewer, page 65; Water, page 69; Streets, page 70
 - f) Other - pages 78 through 82.
5. Energy: Regional energy issues are discussed in detail in the WNP 3/5 EIS.
6. Utilities:
 - a) Energy: Electrical energy is purchased from the Bonneville Power Administration by its own public utility company, the McCleary Public Utility District.
 - b) Communications: Telephone service is provided by the Timberland Telephone Company, a small private company. It is interconnected with Pacific Northwest Bell. The Elma Chronicle and Daily Olympian provide news coverage of the Town's events. Being located near the Puget Sound area, McCleary receives radio broadcasts from most of the Sound's cities including Seattle and Tacoma. Television cable service is provided by a private company out of Montesano.
 - c) Water: See pages 66 through 69, Part I of the plan.
 - d) and e) Sewer: See pages 65 through 67 of the Plan.
 - f) Solid Waste: Disposal service is provided by a small, private company located along Summit Road.
7. Human Health: Discussed on Pages 78 through 80 in Part I of the Comprehensive Plan.
8. Aesthetics: The Town enjoys the characteristics of a small-town environment. Aesthetic pleasures according to residents are discussed in Chapter IX of Part I of the Comprehensive Plan.

9. Recreation: Pages 80 and 81 of Part I, The Comprehensive Plan.

10. Archeological/Historical: There are no known sites of archeological significance. The first original school in McCleary, built in 1890 north of Town, is now used as part of the McCleary Grange Hall.

8. IMPACT OF THE PROPOSAL

The complete implementation of the plan would affect the elements of the Human and Physical Environment in the following ways:

A. Elements of the Physical Environment

1. Earth

- (a) Geology: The proposed plan would permit minor earth movement in excavation and filling incidental to the various types of uses permitted in the plan.
- (b) Soils: The plan would involve substantial disruption of soils as the uses permitted are developed. Disruption would vary from substantial and complete disruption in industrial and commercial areas, to much less in the low density residential areas.
- (c) Topography: The general topography of the area would not be substantially altered, although earth movements related to the various types of development permitted may make very minor alterations in the topography of the area.
- (d) Unique Features: N/A
- (e) Erosion: Removal of vegetation during the construction of various uses would increase overland erosion. Drainage and stream courses would be largely unaffected by the plan, however, and individual projects would be subject to SEPA guidelines.
- (f) Accretion/Avulsion: N/A

2. Air:

- (a) Air Quality: Change in air quality will be relatively minor consisting of increased emissions from increased traffic resulting from moderate growth. The Plan also permits the development of industrial uses. These uses could involve air discharges, but this

is expected also to be minor since such activities are now heavily regulated. All possible emissions of contaminants resulting from this plan would be negligible and perhaps not even measurable.

(b) Odor: Increased traffic would increase associated odors (though in negligible amounts) and industrial uses may involve odors though this cannot now be predicted.

(c) Climate: N/A

3. Water:

(a) Surface Water Movement: Major streams (Wildcat Creek and Sand Creek) and the river would not be modified. Small drainage courses would generally be left in their natural configuration and could only be modified with a showing that the changes would not restrict water flow.

(b) Runoff/Absorption: By permitting greater development and thereby more pavement and other forms of impervious ground cover, absorption of rainfall into the soils would be reduced and runoff would increase. However, the general small-town densities suggested within the plan would not substantially change the character of the area drainage. Localized problems could result, where large areas may be paved in commercial development, but this should be evaluated at the time of development under the procedures of SEPA.

(c) Floods: The Town will be subject to the requirements of the HUD flood insurance program. The flood area of the Town is also subject to permit authority of the Department of Ecology Flood Plains Program. All development then will have to comply with the regulations of these programs which generally require either adequate elevating or flood proofing of facilities. Also they would prevent development which would hinder the discharge of flood waters. Nothing in the plan would change these factors and controls.

(d) Surface Water Quantity: The plan would not have any effect on surface water quantity other than that discussed under runoff above.

- (e) Surface Water Quality: Increased development of all types would increase potential waste discharges. However, the current plans for construction of secondary treatment facilities would improve water quality.
 - (f), (g), and (h) Groundwater: No known impact will be created on groundwater supplies (except as identified next).
 - (i) Public Water Supplies: Increased development will lead to increased demand for water. Study of the current system, a well system, indicate sufficient quantity for development projected here.
4. Flora: The proposed plan would not significantly alter the vegetation of the presently developed areas. However, vegetation may be significantly altered in the southeastern area of the Town. Low density development would also be permitted to intrude into the north and west of the Town if the plan were implemented.

Allowing for possible residential development upon the hill in the southeast corner of Town would replace much of the fir vegetation with domestic landscaping plants associated with residential use. The same is true in the north and west areas of Town although the degree of forestation in these areas is less than on the southeast hill. On these areas, landscaping vegetation would replace meadow grasses and species of trees other than fir. In some areas to the north of Town, where industrial development is encouraged, flora may be replaced altogether by pavement or graveled lots.

The proposed plan is not expected to have impact upon any known unique or endangered species, nor do any significant vegetative corridors appear to be affected by the plan. One of basic purposes of the plan is to cluster development next to the Town in order to reduce urban sprawl which would result in the loss or conversion of much more vegetation.

5. Fauna: The impact of the plan on fauna in the area is similar to that on vegetation. Agricultural animals (predominately cows and horses) would be displaced on agricultural lands to the north and west of Town by development.

Again, by encouraging cluster development near or in Town, the plan is expected to reduce development sprawl which could extensively disrupt wildlife habitats. The plan is not expected to significantly affect fish habitat.

6. Noise: Noises associated with residential uses would generally increase throughout the area, although this would be negligible. Traffic noise would increase along those roads designed as arterials but this would not generally be significant. Traffic noise would also increase in the commercial area, although continued use of the central business district for future commercial uses as proposed in the plan will help keep the adverse effects of this to a minimum.

The impact of industrial uses on noise levels would depend on the type of industry. However, since the plan limits industrial uses to areas to the north of major commercial and residential areas, potential problems would be minimized.

By restricting commercial and industrial activities from residential areas, the residential area would be protected from undue noise.

7. Light and Glare: The impact of the plan on levels of light and glare are largely the same as the impact on noise. Some increases in levels would be related to planned uses but not to significant problem levels. The separation of uses as provided in this plan would keep problems of light and glare from some uses from adversely affecting other uses.
8. Land Use: The plan does not significantly alter land use patterns and no provision of the plan would be a dramatic change from the

existing pattern. In fact, the proposed plan represents an orderly extension of the present pattern. Significant features would include:

- a) Future industrial development occurring north of Simpson and west of Summit adjacent to the Simpson Door Factory.
- b) Low density residential development in the northern, southern, and western areas of Town. Future residential development would be directed towards undeveloped lots and areas within Town and limited within areas around Town. Residential development outside Town would be encouraged westward primarily along the Old Olympic Highway.
- c) Commercial activity concentrated at the Town's center. Area would be reserved here for slight expansion of commercial activity.
- d) Multi-family structures to occur near the Town's center and major transportation routes.

9. Use of Natural Resources: The plan provides for development and, thereby, the use of natural resources which produce construction materials. This, however, is not expected to make any difference in overall consumption of resources which otherwise would have occurred.

The plan would commit land (a non-renewable resource) to development. However, the overall effects of this commitment is expected to be substantially less than what would occur from urban sprawl which the plan seeks to avoid.

10. Risk of Explosion or Hazardous Emission: The plan would have no known effect on these concerns.

B. Elements of the Human Environment

1. Population: The plan seeks to respond to population growth pressure while at the same time seeking to influence the amount and location of that growth. The plan anticipates a moderate rate of growth (between 5% and 12% per decade).

2. Housing. One of the major concerns of the plan is how to respond to growing pressures for new housing starts without substantially changing the character of Town and without sprawl. The plan directs housing starts of all types to specific areas in order to take the pressure off other locations. The plan also encourages housing development in the area immediately west of Town, focuses multiples near arterials and the center, and adds controlled flexibility to present zones. It should also lead to an increase in housing units in the area.
3. Transportation: One of the expected results of the plan is an increase in traffic concurrent with the planned development. One of the basic purposes of the plan is to guide development to areas where they might be most effectively served by existing or planned street systems. Such uses are directed to areas where higher quality streets and/or major intersections are located. The plan, then prevents a haphazard development pattern which would create traffic circulation problems.
4. Public Services: The growth envisioned by the plan would create new demand for all governmental services. However, the plan seeks a land use pattern along with a consideration of the siting of public services which will make the provision of public services more efficient. Added growth without this plan could produce land use patterns which would be difficult to serve efficiently.

The plan suggests servicing in-Town public needs prior to outside needs in order to 1) serve current tax-paying residents 2) prevent sprawl development around the Town's boundaries. In tangible terms, the plan has very little effect upon the rest of the Town's public services.

5. Energy: The plan has little direct impact on the consumption of energy or on the source and availability of energy. It is hoped that the general land use pattern promoted by the plan will result in conservation of energy.

6. Utilities: One of the main purposes of the plan is to promote a future land use pattern which will accommodate anticipated growth pressure in a manner which can be most efficiently served by public utilities.
7. Human Health: The impact of the plan on human health concern is quite general in nature. By responding to anticipated growth in an orderly and efficient manner it is expected that a healthful environment will be produced.

Because the plan promotes the development of sewage and water facilities in-Town, development along roads outside Town will be sparse and will rely primarily upon septic systems, potentially creating health problems relating to water supplies. Existing County ordinances related to the implementation of septic systems seems appropriate to prevent such problems in this area, however.

8. Aesthetics: One of the major concerns of the plan has been to conserve the high aesthetic quality of the Town while responding to mounting growth pressure and changes in housing and other construction. Generally, this is accomplished by directing and limiting higher intensity uses (industrial and commercial) to specific areas in pattern which promote aesthetic potential.
9. Recreation: No impacts upon existing recreation is expected through implementation of the plan.
10. Archeological/Historical: There are no known effects of the plan upon any archeological or historical resources in McCleary.

9 THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE PLAN BETWEEN LOCAL SHORT-TERM USES AND THE MAINTENANCE AND ENHANCEMENT OF LONG-TERM PRODUCTIVITY

A. Identification of Trade-offs between Short-term Gains and Long-Term Losses.

By far the most significant long-term "loss" envisioned in the plan is the conversion of farmland north and west of McCleary to non-farm uses. This occurs since agricultural use potential in the McCleary area does not

outweigh the expected need for other development space in the area. By allowing conversion of agricultural lands to non-agricultural uses in this area, the plan reduces potential loss of more farmland in other areas of East County that would result from continued low density sprawl.

A low density pattern encouraged by the plan might be viewed as a "loss" to some who are in favor of high density development. However, in the long-run, the benefits include. 1) maintaining the small-town characteristics of McCleary; 2) insuring that development does not exceed capability of facilities (water, streets, sewer) to support it; and 3) visual qualities of the Town are maintained.

Implementation of this plan, as with any plan, will involve the commitment of specific areas to certain uses, thereby foreclosing the long-term opportunity to use such areas for other uses. These commitments, however, do not generally consist of a significant departure (except those identified from existing patterns and uses.

B. Benefits and Disadvantages of Reserving Implementation to a Future Time:

Since the area is experiencing considerable growth pressures now as a result of many factors, potential problems exist with the inappropriate commitment of various areas to various uses. If the plan is not implemented soon, the effect would largely be the same as a "no plan" alternative.

While it may be possible to implement some parts of the plan now, while postponing other provisions, this would actually tend to unbalance the plan's attempt to accommodate competing needs (such as housing development vs. conservation of forest lands or Town character), thereby frustrating most plan objectives.

10. IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES

As noted above the major irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources consist of:

- A. The possible commitment of agricultural and forested areas to urban use.
- B. The commitment of undeveloped areas to urban uses.
- C. The general commitment of a land use pattern which also involves the foreclosing of opportunity to employ these areas for other uses.

11. ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS WHICH MAY BE MITIGATED

As in the case of any comprehensive plan, this plan calls for or permits a wide range of activities, projects, and programs. The particular potential adverse impacts of these activities may range from minimal to severe, depending upon the design or manner in which each specific action is done. For this reason the most appropriate place to consider or carry out mitigation is at the stage of implementation. Since each project is subject to the requirements of SEPA, such mitigation may be addressed at that time.

12. ALTERNATIVES TO THE PROPOSAL

The proposed plan is the result of a detailed planning process which has considered alternatives at each step of the process. While virtually every policy in the plan was developed with a consideration of alternatives, the plan formally considered (complete with a public hearing) four overall alternative policy frameworks, two of which are embodied in this plan. Added to these other alternatives is "no action." All alternatives assume the same population size and examine possible land use patterns.

- A. No Action: No action would continue the piece-meal decision-making process which is now occurring, with each decision considering the immediate problem without major consideration of the overall impacts of these incremental decisions. A particular feature of this alternative is a continuation of planning and zoning decisions by the County and Town made independent of one another. In some situations this occurs on a single project.

Continuation of this situation will result in the following:

- 1. Extension of public facilities on a case-by-case basis resulting in possible haphazard patterns.

2. Possible inconsistent zoning decisions resulting from the absence of a policy framework.
3. Possible premature commitment of resources without consideration of alternatives.
4. Continued absence of an overall purpose to the land use policy.
5. Probable continued frustration in meeting emerging housing pressures and problems related thereto.

B. Directing Anticipated Growth to Incorporated Boundaries: This alternative,

the pattern proposed within the plan, poses some problems including:

- 1) An increase in existing development density to a maximum level. (While the density will not overburden the Town's planned facility, the development density may appear high.)
- 2) Change in the Town's physical character. (Related to the first impact, the increased density will affect the small-town character of McCleary though not to a significant degree.)
- 3) Possible increase in housing demand and pressures. (By limiting the amount of land available for development within the area, lands available for housing development could become scarce and increase housing values and costs.)

However, the alternative may also solve many land use problems or prevent them from arising. These attributes include:

- 1) Preserving environmental conditions around the Town thereby, preserving its overall small-town character.
- 2) Preventing rampant escalation of water delivery and sewer collection costs incurred by servicing large areas around the Town.
- 3) Keeping traffic patterns confined to smaller areas resulting in lesser lengths of street facilities to maintain.
- 4) Condensing commercial activities in the more densely settled areas, thereby, encouraging their use by local residents.
- 5) Minimizing land consumption for urban use.

C. Directing Anticipated Growth to Temporary Housing Areas: This alternative also incorporated within the plan under certain conditions suggests allowing the establishment of temporary housing areas designed especially to accommodate mobile living units often associated with construction activity. The major attributes and drawbacks of such a proposal are outlined below:

- 1) The establishment of a temporary housing area is positive if it is desired to preserve existing conditions and character of the area. By establishing such an area, other lands may be less subject to temporary housing development. These areas can also relieve the residential density in Town that can be associated with fast-growing growth development.
- 2) Depending upon its location, capital facility costs would be minimized by establishing a temporary housing area since temporary services can be concentrated rather than dispersed.
- 3) Land consumed by temporary housing structures may be reduced by allowing for the set-up of mobile structures on spaces smaller than what is required on single lots.
- 4) Depending upon where the temporary housing area is located, the impacts upon the existing traffic volumes and patterns and upon commercial activities could be positive or negative. If located along a road used to its capacity, the increased traffic could generate significant traffic problems by overcrowding that road. The housing area, if set far enough away from commercial activities, could create need for retail services within close proximity of the homes, thereby de-centralizing commercial activity.
- 5) Adopting only this alternative would provide no permanent solution to housing shortages. While housing would be provided primarily for construction workers, no policies under this alternative would address the need for increased housing which would shelter the growing population and which would replace dilapidated units.
- 6) Because long-term housing need is expected to exceed housing need to populations associated with nuclear power plant construction, there is actually no need to adopt only this alternative. Development of permanent housing meeting construction worker needs will be used once

the nuclear power plant is completed, therefore eliminating probability of excess housing.

D. Directing Anticipated Growth to Concentrated Service Areas: This alternative suggests allowing new housing development and associated services to establish in areas around Town, not necessarily adjacent to incorporated boundaries. Residents living in such areas would be responsible to County ordinances and would themselves provide one or all of the necessary physical services, such as water distribution, sewer collection, or street construction and maintenance. They most likely would do this by establishing a special "improvement district" as defined in the Revised Code of Washington (RCW).

The major impacts of such an alternative include:

- 1) Increasing the risk of environmental change and growth deterioration as the number of septic tanks increase, (at least in water and street improvement districts.)
- 2) Change in surrounding character of the area to reflect a "sub-urban" or bedroom community.
- 3) Relieving the pressures for higher cost housing (as housing in such areas would probably be designed for upper-middle income groups) thereby, stabilizing housing costs within the Town.
- 4) Potentially effecting capital facility costs to the Town positively or negatively. (Establishment of an improvement district near developing areas adjacent the Town may necessitate eventual annexation forcing the Town to accept responsibility for servicing such areas. On the positive side, should the service districts remain isolated from Town services, facility costs of growth to the Town may be minimized.)
- 5) Lessening the potential development density within the Town's unincorporated boundaries.
- 6) Increasing land consumption by future development outside the Town's incorporated boundaries.

- 7) Potentially overloading existing roads and changing areawide patterns depending upon where such service areas are located.
- 8) Creating demands for commercial services away from the central commercial area in Town.

E. Encouraging Dispersed Development in a Broad, Even Pattern Around Town:

Most of the impacts associated with this alternative are negative including:

- 1) Increasing land consumption to a high degree thereby affecting the small-town character of McCleary and degrading environmental quality.
- 2) Greatly increasing costs of water distribution and sewer collection to the Town residents.
- 3) Possibly sprawling commercial services over a broad area thereby, limiting the effectiveness of a centralized business area.
- 4) Producing an unpredictable traffic pattern since particular areas are not designated for receiving development.

On a positive note, this alternative would conserve a low development density of the Town and relieve housing pressure within the incorporated limits.

Further details of these various alternatives--including conceptual mapping--may be obtained from the Grays Harbor Regional Planning Commission at 207½ E. Market, Aberdeen.

13. UNAVOIDABLE ADVERSE IMPACTS:

The adverse impacts which would occur over present conditions if this plan were implemented may be classified into three groups:

- A. The plan commits the Town to a moderate level of growth. This growth would produce:
 1. Increased traffic.
 2. Slightly increased noise, light and glare, mainly derived from increase traffic.
 3. Slightly increased fumes and odors, again arising largely from increase traffic.
 4. Increased demand for all public services.

5. Increased consumption of water, energy and other forms of resources.
6. Increased waste generation.

B. The plan commits areas to particular commercial, industrial, and residential uses, thereby foreclosing the use of each area for another use. The most significant of these include:

1. Conversion of agricultural lands around the Town.
2. Conversion of undeveloped area within Town.
3. Expansion of industrial area.
4. Expansion of the commercial area.
5. Increased area committed to development would reduce absorption capacity of the soils.
6. The commitment of larger area to development would produce some displacement of wildlife.

C. The plan would permit new uses to be established thus creating various impacts related to construction activity including:

1. Earth movement.
2. Disruption of soils.
3. Removal of vegetation.
4. Erosion of disrupted soils.
5. Increased noise, glare and fumes related to construction activity.
6. Increased consumption of fuels and building materials.

The plan commits future growth to a combination of alternatives B and C mentioned in section 12 above. It is essential to note that all discussions in this statement have compared conditions that would result from the implementation of the plan from present conditions only. If comparison is made with the individual alternative courses of action which illustrate various possible futures, all of the impacts identified above which would be less under this alternative than under any of the other alternatives except the no growth option. While no growth would avoid almost all of the adverse impacts above, it would lead to other impacts of a highly significant nature, such as urban sprawl, increased property values, displacement of segments of the population, and severe housing problems.

NOAA COASTAL SERVICES CTR LIBRARY



3 6668 14112752 4
